

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

14

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/004,365	11/01/2001	James Lynn Baratuci	TRUSP0105USA	7294	
6449	7590 03/25/2004		EXAMINER		
ROTHWEL	ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			KATCHEVES, BASIL S	
1425 K STR SUITE 800	EET, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20005		3635		
			DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/004,365	BARATUCI ET	AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Basil Katcheves	3635	M41
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence	address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1, after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a i ply within the statutory minimum of thin I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become Af	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered tin NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nely. s communication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21.	January 2004.		
_	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to t	he merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	· •	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		` '	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			• • •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form I	PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	nts have been received. Its have been received in A Ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this Nation	al Stage
See the attached detailed Office action for a ils	t of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	5) D Notice of I	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (P	TO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	<u>_</u> ·	

Application/Control Number: 10/004,365

Art Unit: 3635

Double Patenting

Claims 1-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,341 B1 to Baratuci et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,891,007 to Kleykamp as in the rejection of paper no. 11.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art is not flexible. However, the prior art is disclosed as flexible being flexible (Baratuci column 2, lines 46-48, Kleykamp abstract lines 4-5). Applicant argues that Kleykamp cannot be used with Baratuci because the combination would defeat the purpose of Bartuci's shim. Because the flexible tube of Kleykamp may make the shim unnecessary to use, does not mean that the tube can not be used. Kleykamp is a ribbed tube, and as combined with Baratuci, discloses the basic claim structure of the instant application.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Application/Control Number: 10/004,365

Art Unit: 3635

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Page 3

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (703) 306-0232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (703) 308-0832.

BK &

3/23/04

Carl D. Friedman Supervisory Patent Examiner **Group 3600**